

M/027/087

David J. Ryzak  
617 E. 18<sup>th</sup> Way  
Burley, Idaho 83318

February 4, 2005

Mr. Tom Munson  
Department of Natural Resources  
Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining  
P. O. Box 145801  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

RECEIVED  
FEB 07 2005  
DIV. OF OIL, GAS & MINING

*Review in  
review drawer.*

re: Rocanville Stone; Tejon Quarries Third Review

Dear Tom:

Enclosed are the responses to DOGM's Third Review of Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations for Rocanville Stone's Tejon Quarries; M/027/087. A considerable revision has been made for some of the responses. Revisions to sentences are underlined where additions have been made. Newly added sentences are likewise underlined. Redline is used where deletions have been made. No changes of any kind have been made to any sections not included in this response.

One map was added, one map was resubmitted, and three maps were revised because of the questions asked in the Third Review. The added map is Map D-2; "Cross Sections A-A', E-E' to answer a question regarding R647-4-105.3. The resubmitted map is Map E-3. It was included to answer a question regarding R647-4-107.6. Map E-3 had been included with the submission for the Initial Review. There have been no changes to this map. Map F-1, Map F-2, and Map F-3 all labeled "Highwalls After Reclamation" have been revised as a result of a question regarding R647-4-110.2.

Incorporation of new items included with the Third Review resulted in an increase in the Reclamation Surety Estimate to \$86,730. Some savings from DOGM's proposed \$95,900 were made by using the cost figures supplied by DOGM for "estimate D8" with the "last unit cost update" of 10/07/02. A copy of this form is included with the information requested. The Reclamation Surety Estimate included with the Third Review has the same "last unit cost update" of 10/07/02, but with some higher unit costs. Additional savings will be possible with application of fertilizer instead of compost at a cost savings of over \$5,500. Concerning the three items listed under "Ripping," the total area to receive reclamation treatments will not exceed 19.2 acres. (3.3 ac + 3.5 ac + 12.4 ac = 19.2 ac). In what other ways will it be possible to reduce the total cost of reclamation without making the operation inefficient or reducing the number of acres to be affected by the operation? The small size of the individual quarries makes any significant amount of interim reclamation unfeasible.

Sincerely,

*David J. Ryzak*

David J. Ryzak

Enclosures  
cc: Mert Hamilton